

REMARKS


Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 7-14 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-6 are rejected. In this Response, no claims are added or canceled, and claims 2-6 are amended to correct a minor informality. Accordingly, claims 1-6 are at issue.

Claims 1-15 were rejected as unpatentable over Sekiguchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,771,327) in view of Nielson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,331,840, hereinafter "Nielson"). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Sekiguchi and Nielson fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1. For example, neither reference, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests "a display panel including *a substrate wherein display devices are formed*" (emphasis added). The Examiner concedes that Sekiguchi fails to teach the emphasized limitation. See Page 3 of the Official Action. The Examiner contends instead that Nielson provides a teaching of this limitation. Applicants respectfully submit that Nielson does not teach or suggest this limitation. Though Nielson does mention multi-display computing devices, nowhere does Nielson disclose those displays are formed in the same substrate. To the contrary of the claim limitation, Nielson discloses that software is necessary to map the displays to a single virtual desktop. See column 1, lines 55-57 of Nielson. In Nielson, the display surface is either a single display on a continuous display surface, or multiple displays in a discontinuous display service, *i.e.*, not the same substrate. In either case, Nielson fails to teach or suggest the above limitation. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that *prima facie* obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected as unpatentable over Sekiguchi in view of Nielson, and further in view of Siwinski (U.S. Pat. No. 6,814,642). Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection. Applicants submit that the propriety of the rejection of claim 6 depends on the assertion that Sekiguchi and Nielson teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1. As previously explained, that assertion is erroneous. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


_____, Reg. 51,312
A. Wesley Perrebee
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Customer ID No. 26263
Attorneys for Applicant